APPENDIX A: TRPA INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Print Form

128 Market St. Stateline, NV

Phone: (775) 588-4547

PO Box 5310 Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Fax: (775) 588-4527

Mon-Fri 9:00 am-5:00 pm

www.trpa.org

Accepting Applications 9:00 am-4:00 pm

trpa@trpa.org

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

I. Assessor's Par	cel Number (APN)/Project Location		Various	
Project Name	Kings Beach WQ and SEZ Impr	ovement	County/City	Placer

Brief Description of Project:

Placer County Department of Public Works proposes to reduce fine sediment and nutrients in stormwater reaching Lake Tahoe throughout the entire Kings Beach grid, decrease stream velocities and channel erosion in the Griff Creek and Coon Street stream environment zones (SEZs), and improve fish passage and habitat in Griff Creek. The Project proposes to accomplish its purpose by stabilizing exposed soils with vegetation and/or mulch; improving the existing drainage system with new curbs, gutters, earthen berms and underground pipes; and treating runoff with a variety of methods including fill removal, sediment traps and vaults, swales, infiltration and/or detention basins, and media filters. In addition, the Project proposes to improve fish passage and habitat in Griff Creek by replacing culverts, constructing inchannel habitat features, excavating portions of channel, constructing new channel, and installing rock channel bed stabilization (grade control) structures.

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. Land						
	Wi	Il the proposal result in:				
	a.	Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES		he		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b.	A change in the topography or ground surface relief feature inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?	es of	site		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	c.	Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the p	ropo	sal?		
				Yes		No
			X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substruction grading in excess of 5 feet?	tures	s or		
			X	Yes		No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	e.	The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of seither on or off the site?	soils,			

⋉ No

Data Insufficient

No, With

Mitigation

	f.	Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or ch siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral pr which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the lake?	oces	sses,		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	g.	Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, r ground failure, or similar hazards?		slides,		
				Yes	X	No
2. Air	Qua	lity		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
		Il the proposal result in:				
	a.	Substantial air pollutant emissions?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b.	Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	C.	The creation of objectionable odors?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any in climate, either locally or regionally?	cha	nge		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	e. Increased use of diesel fuel?				
		X	Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
3. Wate	er Quality				
	Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water mov	/eme	ents?		
		X	Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	 b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the 	n run			
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?				
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?				
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surfac quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved turbidity?				
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	X Yes	☐ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through di additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an a or excavations?		
	☐ Yes	⋈ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise a public water supplies?	vailable for	
	☐ Yes	⋉ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazard flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occ seiches?		
	Yes	⋉ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the ground alteration of groundwater quality?	water or any	
	Yes	No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drining water s	source?	
	┌ Yes	ヌ No
	No, With	Data
	☐ Mitigation	Insufficient

f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?

4. Vegetation

Will the proposal result in:

a.	a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?					
			Yes	X	No	
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient	
b.	Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associat critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or included lowering of the groundwater table?		ith			
			Yes		No	
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient	
C.	Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishmen species?					
			Yes	X	No	
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient	
d.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, m and aquatic plants)?					
			Yes		No	
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient	
e.	Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangere of plants?	d sp	ecies			
			Yes		No	
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient	

f.	Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, in woody vegetation such as willows?	cludi	ng		
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
g.	Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees30 inches or in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conserva Recreation land use classifications?				
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
h.	A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosys	tem?	?		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
5. Wildlife					
Wi	Il the proposal result in:				
a.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, the shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians microfauna)?	ish a			
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered of animals?	spe	ecies		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	C.	Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or resbarrier to the migration or movement of animals?	sult i	n a		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or qu	ıality	?		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
6. Nois	е					
	Wi	Il the proposal result in:				
	t	Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statem Community Plan or Master Plan?		EL)		
				Yes		No
			X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b.	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	C.	Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the Noise Environmental Threshold?	ne TF	RPA		
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal: a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting? ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area? ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands? ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials? ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient 8. Land Use Will the proposal: a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan? ▼ No Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient

b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?				
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
9. Natural Resources				
Will the proposal result in:				
a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural reso	urce	s?		
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource	e?			
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
10. Risk of Upset				
Will the proposal:				
a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, ch radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?	emic	als, or		
		Yes		No
	X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuatio	n pla	n?		
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

11. Population

Will the proposal: a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region? ▼ No Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents? ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient 12. Housing Will the proposal: a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions: (1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region? ▼ No Data Mitigation Insufficient (2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households? ▼ No No, With Data Insufficient Mitigation

Number of Existing Dwelling Units:

Number of Proposed Dwelling Units:0

b.	Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-incovery-low-income households?	me a	and		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
13. Transp	ortation/Circulation				
Wil	Il the proposal result in:				
a.	Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DV	/TE)	?		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new pa	arkin	g?		
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	inclu	ıding		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement or and/or goods?	f ped	pple		
	C		Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?				
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	f.	Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?	r			
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
I4. Pul	olic	Services				
		I the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a v or altered governmental services in any of the following a				
	a.	Fire protection?		Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b.	Police protection?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	C.	Schools?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Parks or other recreational facilities?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	e.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				
				Yes	X	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	f. Other governmental services?				
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
15. En	ergy				
	Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?				
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of en require the development of new sources of energy?	iergy	, or		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
16. Ut	ilities				
	Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities		d for		
	a. Power or natural gas?		Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b. Communication systems?				
			Yes	×	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the ma permitted capacity of the service provider?	ximu	m		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?			
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e. Storm water drainage?				
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
f. Solid waste and disposal?				
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
17. Human Health				
Will the proposal result in:				
 a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (emental health)? 	xclud	ling		
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?				
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

18. Scenic Resources/Community Design

Will the proposal:

a.	Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?				
		X	Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designation bicycle trail?	ted			
		X	Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other seen from a public road or other public area?	ceni	c vista		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Be inconsistent with the height and design standards requir applicable ordinance or Community Plan?	ed b	y the		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	Pro	gram		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

19. Recreation

Does the proposal: a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities? ▼ No Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Create additional recreation capacity? Yes ▼ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed? No ∀es No, With Data Insufficient Mitigation d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands? ▼ Yes No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient 20. Archaeological/Historical a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building? ▼ No Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient

	Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, includes resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or reconstruction.	udin	g		
		×	Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
c.	Is the property associated with any historically significant and/or sites or persons?	evei	nts		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical ch which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	ang	е		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or suses within the potential impact area?	acre	ed		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
21. Findin	gs of Significance.				
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a pla animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examinajor periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?	ulation Int oof of a	on to r rare or		
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

b.	disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term, to impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relative definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure the future.)	erm ly br	ief,		
			Yes	X	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Does the project have impacts which are individually limite cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two of separate resources where the impact on each resource is small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on environmental is significant?)	or mo relat	ore		
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Does the project have environmental impacts which will causubstantial adverse effects on human being, either directly indirectly?				
			Yes		No
		X	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

DECLARATION:I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best ofmy ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature: (Original signature required.)			
Person Preparing Application	At	County	Date:
Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if ne	ecessary)		
See attached sheets for Environmental Impacts			

TRPA--IEC 20 of 25 4/9/02

Print Form

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY Date Received: By: Determination: On the basis of this evaluation: a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure. ☐ No b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures. No c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure ┌ No Date: Signature of Evaluator Title of Evaluator

ADDENDUM FOR TRANSFERS/CONVERSIONS OF USE

The following is to be used as a supplemental checklist for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). It is to be used when reviewing any transfer pursuant to Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances or Conversion of Use pursuant to Chapter 33 of the Code of Ordinances. Any question answered in the affirmative will require written documentation showing that the impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Otherwise, an environmental impact statement will be required.

The asterisk (*) notes threshold subjects.

a)	$\frac{\text{Land}}{\text{Does}} ^*$ Does the proposal result in any additional land coverage?			
			Yes	No
			No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
b)	Air Quality * Does the proposal result in any additional emission?			
			Yes	No
			No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
c)	Water * Does the proposal result in any additional discharge that violation of TRPA discharge standards?	is in		
			Yes	No
			No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
d)	Does the proposal result in an increase in the volume of dis	schai	ge?	
			Yes	No
			No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
e)	Noise * Does the proposal result in an increase in Community No Equivalency Level (CNEL)?	oise		
			Yes	No
			No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient

т)	Aestnetics * Does the proposal result in blockage of significant views to Lake Tahoe or an identified visual resource?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
g)	Recreation * Does the proposal result in a reduction of public access t recreation areas or public recreation opportunities?	o pu	blic		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
h)	Land Use Does the converted or transferred use result in a use consistent with the goals and policies of the Community I Area Statement?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
i)	Population Does the proposal result in an increase in the existing or population of the Region?	plan	ned		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
j)	Housing Does the proposal result in the loss of affordable housing?	þ			
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

k)	Transportation Does the proposal result in the increase of100 Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
l)	Does the proposal result in a project that does not meet t standards?	the p	arking		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
m)	Utilities Does the proposal result in additional water use?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
n)	Does the proposal result in the need for additional sewer tr	eatm	ent?		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
0)	Historical Does the proposal result in the modification or elimination historic structure or site?	n of a	a		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

and belief. Signature: (Original signature required.) Date: County Person Preparing Application Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge

DECLARATION:

TRPA--IEC 25 of 25 4/9/02

Environmental Impacts

Herewith are written comments supporting the "Yes" and "No, with Mitigation" responses found on the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist for the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project.

1. Land

- 1.c. Will the proposal result in unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal? No, with Mitigation. Geologic impacts are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the project.
- 1.d. Will the proposal result in changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Changes in undisturbed soil will occur where improvements are proposed on California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) or US Forest Service land. Erosion control features that are proposed on these lands include basins, rock lined channels, swales, sediment traps, rock bowls, earthen berms and storm drain pipes. Basins, rock bowls, sediment traps, and storm drain pipes may require grading in excess of 5 feet. Areas that are disturbed will be revegetated with native vegetation and will increase the ability of the land to infiltrate storm water. All excavations will be completed in a manner that abides by TRPA Code of Ordinances 64.7 for interception of groundwater and depth. Since the project is installing necessary measures to improve water quality, findings (64.7A(2)(e)) can be made to allow interception of groundwater if a dewatering plan is in place. Excavations for basins will be performed when the groundwater table is seasonally low, however, a dewatering plan will be part of the SWPPP. The overall goal of the project is to decrease erosion and increase soil stability and the proposed improvements are necessary to achieve this.

2. Air Quality

2.e. Will the proposal result in increased use of diesel fuel? Yes. The construction of the project will require the use of construction equipment, which will require the use of diesel fuel. While the project will not result in any long-term demand for diesel fuel, the construction activities will require a temporary increase of diesel fuel use.

3. Water Quality

- **3.a.** Will the proposal result in changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Impacts to hydrology and water quality are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in adverse changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements.
- **3.c.** Will the proposal result in alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters? No, with Mitigation. Impacts to hydrology and water quality are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in permanent alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters.
- 3.e. Will the proposal result in discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity? No,

November 2008

with Mitigation. The purpose of Project improvements is to improve the quality of stormwater and snowmelt runoff from County roads through the use of infiltration, detention, and settling basins. Over the long term, water quality will improve. Construction activities however, have the potential of impacting water quality in the short-term during storm events or accidental fuel spills from construction equipment. Also, construction-related activities for the creek enhancement work include diverting Griff Creek in two places, installing bypass pipe, removing existing culverts, and installing new open-arch culverts. These activities could potentially cause erosion and impact water quality.

Placer County will require the contractor to implement BMPs that specifically address threats to water quality. Temporary erosion control measures will be implemented based on TRPA requirements.

Placer County staff and/or contractor will have access to a turbidity meter at all times. Turbidity readings will be conducted as often as necessary to ensure compliance with all applicable water quality standards. Should turbidity data indicate non-compliance, Placer county staff and/or contractor will initiate remedial action to address the threat to water quality. Griff Creek flows will be monitored and diversion activities will take place when the creek is at base flow.

3.f. Will the proposal result in alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Groundwater elevations range from approximately 2.5-feet below ground surface (BGS) to 9-feet BGS with elevations fluctuating from highs in the late winter and spring to lows in the summer and fall. The project includes basins, rock bowls, swales, and rock lined channels to treat and infiltrate surface water. These improvements will likely intercept some ground water when the water table is high and possibly convey or temporarily hold it. Installation of storm drains, infiltration trenches, and other Project appurtenances may affect groundwater flow in the Project Area or create preferential groundwater flow pathways.

Proposed improvements will not adversely affect or interfere with groundwater recharge or cause a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Some of the proposed improvements will spread flow to increase infiltration to the groundwater. The proposed improvements would increase the local water table elevation. However, no adverse effects on the surrounding water table or water quality are anticipated.

3.j. Will the proposal result in the potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality? No, with Mitigation. Hazard impacts are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in the potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality.

4. Vegetation

4.b. Will the proposal result in removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table? No, with Mitigation. Impacts to biological resources are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in permanent removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat. The result of the restoration will be improved riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat.

IEC-2 November 2008

- 4.d. Will the proposal result in change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants)? No, with Mitigation. Impacts to biological resources are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in adverse change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants.
- **4.e.** Will the proposal result in reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants? No, with Mitigation. Impacts to biological resources are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in permanent reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants.
- 4.f. Will the proposal result in removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows? No, with Mitigation. See 4.b.

6. Noise

6.a. Will the proposal result in increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan? No, with Mitigation. Noise impacts to are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan.

10. Risk of Upset

10.a. Will the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions? No, with Mitigation. Hazard impacts to are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances.

13. Transportation/Circulation

13.b. Will the proposal result in changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? No, with Mitigation. Transportation impacts to are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in permanent changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking.

18. Scenic Resources/ Community Design

18.a. Will the proposal be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Features of the project will be visible from both State Route (SR) 28 and SR 267. Outfall structures will be visible from Lake Tahoe. Some of the existing outfalls would be upgraded for increased volume, but the locations and overall aesthetic appearance of the outfall structures would remain the same. No additional outfalls to Lake Tahoe would be constructed. None of the other facilities, such as detention basins and rock bowls, would be visible from Lake Tahoe.

November 2008

All of these proposed structures will meet the design guidelines set forth in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and are permissible uses according to the Kings Beach Community Plans and the applicable Plan Area Statements. Furthermore, many of the improvements will be below ground. In addition, several Project features, including detention basins and earthen berms, would be constructed in areas where existing conditions are disturbed and where existing views consist of weedy vegetation, rubble piles, and fill. All above ground improvements will be less than two feet high and would be painted or formed to match surrounding structures, vegetation or natural features. Therefore, addition of Project features would result in a net long-term aesthetic improvement over existing conditions when constructed and maintained in conformance with the design of the proposed Project.

18.b. Will the proposal be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Some of the proposed improvements (outfalls) will be visible from the Kings Beach State Recreation Area (KBSRA). As stated in 18.a, Some of the existing outfalls would be upgraded for increased volume, but the locations and overall aesthetic appearance of the outfall structures would remain the same. No additional outfalls to Lake Tahoe would be constructed. None of the other facilities, such as detention basins and rock bowls, would be visible from the KBSRA. All of these proposed structures will meet the design guidelines set forth in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and are permissible uses according to the Kings Beach Community Plans and the applicable Plan Area Statements.

19. Recreation

19.c. Does the proposal have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed? Yes, but no long-term adverse impact will occur. The project construction will include construction with the Kings Beach recreational area, including the boat launch and state park/beach area. The construction will be limited to the installation of storm drainage pipe, manholes, filtration systems and upgrading the outfalls to the Lake. These installations will require temporary closures of the facilities (each area closed for up to 3 weeks total for the construction of the project) and will be during off peak times (May 1 – Memorial day or Labor day to October 15) in order to minimize the impact to the recreating public.

19.d. Does the proposal result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands? Yes. See response to 19.c above.

20. Archeological/Historical

20.b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records? Yes, but no adverse impact will occur. Impacts to cultural resources are analyzed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in adverse impacts to cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources.

21. Findings of Significance

21.a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory? No, with Mitigation. Impacts to biological and cultural resources are analyzed in Sections 4.5 and 4.6, respectively, of the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation

IEC-4 November 2008

Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not degrade the biological or cultural resources in the Project area. The Project would in fact result in environmental benefits to biological resources, hydrology and water quality.

21.c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?) No, with Mitigation. Cumulative impacts are evaluated in Section 4.21 of the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document, incorporated herein by reference. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in that document, the Project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

21.d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? No, with Mitigation. Following implementation of the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures prescribed in the Kings Beach Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone Improvement Project Environmental Compliance Document (incorporated herein by reference), the Project would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project impacts to people in the area, including but not limited to those related to aesthetics, air quality, climate change, environmental justice, hazardous materials, noise, population, housing, public services, traffic, utilities and service systems, will be less than significant or nonexistent.

November 2008